REMARKS

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, and Claim Amendments

1. In claim 14, the structure identifier (IVX) was corrected to (XIV) as suggested by the Office Action. The same correction is also made in the corresponding part of the specification.

2. Reference to structure (XVIII) in claims 14 and 56 was deleted as said structure is also missing from the specification. See, e.g., page 24. The same correction is also made in the corresponding part of the specification.

3. The structure identifier (XIX) after (XXVIII) was corrected to (XXIX) as suggested by the Office Action. The same correction is also made in the corresponding part of the specification.

4. Applicants thank the Examiner for noting the obvious error in the group -PO3M1, which error also occurs in the specification. This is a clearly typing/valency error or mistake. Applicant's intention was $-PO_3(M_1)_2$, which is clear from the application. Accordingly, the obvious correction has been made both in claim 14 and in the corresponding parts of the specification.

As heteroatom in this context the application always lists oxygen, nitrogen, sulfur and phosphor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have had no reason at all to select any other heteroatom instead of phosphor in this specific context. And no other special attribute has been associated to the respective heteroatom (phosphor in the objected case). The group always consists just of the heteroatom itself, oxygen and hydrogen or alkali metal, where M_1 represents an alkali metal or hydrogen. To be chemically correct the formula must therefore read - $PO_3(M_1)_2$.

The Advisory Action alleges that the heteroatom may have been, e.g., Se or As. The listing of any other heteroatom than phosphor within this context of the application (which is how one of ordinary skill in the art would read the error and would try to figure out the correct answer, which is obvious in the present case) would be very highly unexpected and very highly unlikely. For example, selenium is never mentioned in the application and arsenic is mentioned only once within the definition of preferred metal complexes A2 as AsF6-. In addition to that, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that an error in an index/valency is surely much more likely than the citation of a wrong atom. And the correction of an index also has much less impact on the general principle of the invention than the change of an atom. Based on that, there

is no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to even speculate on assumptions regarding the identify of the heteroatom, but would accept, especially in the context of the application, that the correct heteroatom is phosphor. As a logical consequence, and to be chemically correct also, the formula must therefore read $-PO_3(M_1)_2$, which also includes $-PO_3HM_1$, since M_1 can be H among other options, i.e., is a selection of $-PO_3(M_1)_2$.

Reconsideration is respectfully and courteously requested.

5. This issue is moot as indicated in the Advisory Action.

6. The claim is further clarified in view of the comments provided in the Advisory Action by specifying that the groups R_{19}-R_{21}, etc., together with the respective carbon atoms to which they are attached form a ring.

Additional Amendments

The group "R_{21}"was identified as "R_21" in claim 14 and in the corresponding part of the specification. The appropriate correction to "R_{21}"has been made in both places.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Direct Dial: 703-812-5331
Facsimile: 703-243-6410

Filed: August 21, 2009

K:\EPROV\17\REPLY AUG 09 NO 2.DOC